



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the occurrence of the almost daily meaningless encounters on French soil, which keep alive the false notion of honor and render respect for human life very small. The press, with its tremendous power in that country, could write all these senseless and inhuman challenges and "meetings of honor" out of existence in ten years or less, if it only got down to a right conception of the unreasonableness as well as the immorality of the thing, and of its own responsibility for the survival of the evil.

If M. de Morès was a murderer for having killed M. Mayer in this duel, M. Mayer was in spirit a murderer for having tried to kill M. de Morès and a suicide for having put himself into a position to be killed. The queer thing about it all is that these Frenchmen cannot see that a duel settles nothing with regard to honor. It may prove that the men are not cowards, in the ordinary sense of the word, but as to honor it proves nothing. The one who is killed or wounded or in any way gets the worst of it, is not changed one whit in reference to his character, unless perhaps his honor has gone down several points because of the fight. The same is true of the victor. It would seem as if a sensible look at the question would prevent any man of ordinary sense from being guilty of a thing so silly as to fight a duel.

The duel has passed through three stages. First, its existence under the laws. "If two neighbors," say the laws of Dagobert, "have a dispute about the borders of their possessions, let a piece of turf be taken up in the contested spot; let the two parties, while touching it with the points of their swords, call God to witness as to the justice of their claims; let them afterwards fight and let the victory decide the question of right." This is what is known in feudal history as the "judgment or decision of God." In the case of capital crimes the vanquished was dragged out on a hurdle *en chemise* and hanged, dead or alive, as a perjurer. Monks fought duels over religious disputes. Teamsters on the road fought duels with clubs. In the case of the nobility these duels were attended with great pomp and display. The second stage, was the prohibition of the duel. This was first done by Henry II, of France, who was very deeply grieved over the death in a duel of one of his favorites. During this second stage, the duel still continued, in spite of laws, to be a serious and deadly thing. Often no attempt was made to execute laws which might happen to exist against it. The third stage, through which the duel is now passing, is that in which public sentiment has in most civilized countries set itself strongly against the inhuman and barbarous custom and permitted it to exist, with rare exceptions, only in its make-believe form. It will doubtless linger a few decades longer in some of the countries of the old world where it still "runs in the blood," but we may hope that the combatants will be wise (?) enough to "fire in the air" or to remove with their foils only a little of the hairy scalp or better still to end the fray "with a breakfast."

THE HOMESTEAD CONFLICT.

Not since 1877, has the country been so stirred over a labor trouble as over that through which Homestead has just past. There have been almost at the same time other similar difficulties in other parts of the world which, but for the overshadowing seriousness of this one, would have attracted much attention. But all eyes have been turned towards the great Carnegie works, and millions upon millions of newspaper pages have daily carried the details of the conflict to almost every place in the land. The great public interest which has accompanied the events of each day has not been caused simply by the fact that there was a battle—a cruel, merciless battle, like all battles—in which a number of persons were killed and wounded, this lock-out strike, while resembling in certain phases all others, has been peculiar in several respects.

1. The men were not suffering from low wages, and did not really strike for an increase. Many of them were receiving pay, which from the standpoint of ordinary day-labor, seems surprisingly high. Workmen that earn from \$80 to \$150 per month, as a number of these did, do not strike for better wages simply.

2. The men were not of what are ordinarily called the ignorant and shiftless classes. Many of them had saved money and had built up homes for themselves. There were, of course, in the crowds on the day of the battle a number from the vagabond and criminal classes, but the leaders in the movement were skilled and intelligent workmen and property holders.

3. The trouble did not really spring from a proposed reduction of wages. The company had not said "we will give you so much and no more, and if you will not work for that you must quit." Not until after conference after conference between the company and the workmen had been held, was anything like this said.

What was, then, the real cause of the strike and lock-out? It seems that the deepest questions of the labor and capital problem are involved in the difficulty. It is not to our purpose to go into the details of the affair nor to say on which side the chief blame lay in this particular case. It would not be difficult to show that both sides have been seriously at fault at different stages of the trouble.

(a) The first cause of the strike is the wrong principle lying in the foundation of labor organizations. Men ought to keep themselves free to make engagements where they will, and if they associate, which is perfectly right, to help one another, it ought not to be on such a basis that thousands of men can be tyrannized over by others, or by a few more intelligent and headstrong leaders. Individual capitalists and laborers must be free to make contracts as individuals.

(b) The second cause of the difficulty is the increased

intelligence and sense of independence of workmen coupled with a lack of proper moral and religious ideas leading to increased self-control and a deepening sense of personal responsibility under better privileges. The conflict between labor and capital will never cease till the Christian principles of love and kindness and a considerable regard for others come to actuate employee and employer alike. Regiments of soldiers may suppress insurrections already arisen, but such riots will be inevitable until workmen and employers both live according to the golden rule and the second commandment of Christ.

(c) The third cause of the conflict is the suspicion and dislike still lingering in the minds of the wage-earning classes, caused by the former tyranny of the wealthy classes. Capital has lost much of its former tyranny and grinding selfishness, but it may expect to reap for a long time yet what it has sown in the centuries past, unless it shall show itself exceptionally kind and tender and self-sacrificing toward the laboring classes and the needy. Capital, in asserting its rights and defending itself against the occasional lawlessness of excited labor, must not forget that it has exceptional obligations arising out of superior intelligence and superior power. It must be the leader in social reform or suffer the consequences of its unfaithfulness. Industrial war, as all war, is wrong, but if it is to cease, the sins and wrongs which lie behind it must be repented of and abandoned.

At the present writing, the Homestead trouble is far from over. Arrests are being made of leaders of the mob on charges of murder and threats are being made of having Mr. Carnegie himself arrested on a charge of treason, for having brought armed Pinkertons to the place contrary to and in violation of the laws of the State.

THE PRICE OF GLORY.

Under the above title Thomas Grimm, in the *Petit Journal*, of Paris, gives expression to some startling facts about the relative decrease of population in France. He says that many causes have been assigned for this condition of things, among others the civil laws requiring the equal distribution of inheritances, alcoholism, the increase of riches, religious celibacy, continental wars, military service in the colonies, looseness of morals, emigration, etc. But many of these causes he thinks work as effectively in other countries as in France. The unfortunate thing for his own country is, he confesses, that while two or three of these causes are active in other countries, France has them all to bear. He then cites some statements of Doctor Lagneau, who has made a special study of this particular subject.

From 1791 to 1799, more than two millions of men were forced into war, of whom one-third were destroyed.

From 1800 to 1813 over three millions served in the Napoleonic wars. In 1814, only six hundred thousand of these remained, about one-fifth of them. After the battle of Leipzig only male *children* remained in France. Three invasions from 1815 to 1870, provoked by the wars of Napoleon, continued the slaughter of the French. Three or four years of civil war and a disastrous expedition in Egypt complete the picture. "To-day we feel the void caused by the small number of births, by the absence of offspring from those strong men taken away from the fields and the shops and slain without leaving any posterity." Those at home who propagated the race were the weak and diseased. Hence the general diminution of the vigor of the people. We are paying to-day the price of glory.

It may be added to what Mr. Grimm says, that these long-continued and disastrous wars were responsible in large measure for the general decline of sexual morality among the French. Multitudes of young widows were left all over France to gain their living as they could, and with the few places open to women in Europe for the last half century the outcome can easily be imagined. The evils of war are many-sided, and it is a hopeful sign for France that her statesmen and scholars are beginning honestly to consider what their military glory has cost them. The spirit of the people is rapidly changing and there will be no more French wars for glory.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

Our friends in England have been very busy during the recent political campaign. They have brought their ideas of peace and arbitration before the electors in Great Britain in a more thorough and systematic way than usual. All the Societies of Peace and Arbitration, including many of the Local Unions, have issued addresses and appeals to the voters, in many instances insisting that the candidates should commit themselves on this vital question. These appeals, published in the newspapers, have been sent broadcast over the land, and there is probably not a candidate, Tory or Liberal, who has not been made to feel to some extent the existence and increasing weight in the affairs of the nation of these organizations. We need not expect that the immediate effects of this work will be very appreciable in the action of Parliament, but it will bear fruit in time, just as the persistent agitation of the past is now bearing visible fruit. It is sincerely to be hoped that the restoration of the Liberals to power may have the effect to prevent England from becoming any further entangled in the meshes of continental quarrels. Lord Salisbury has spoken for peace, has really at heart been a peace man, but his approaches toward Italy have demonstrated that his real plan for